DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 689 SP 033 595

AUTHOR Sclan, Eileen; Darling-Hammond, Linda
TITLE Beginning Teacher Performance Evaluation: An Overview of State Policies. Trends and Issues Paper No. 7.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO ISBN-89333-092-2
PUB DATE Mar 92
CONTRACT RI88062015
NOTE 55p.
AVAILABLE FROM ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-1186 ($12.00 plus $2.50 for shipping and handling).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Clearinghouse Products (071)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; Performance Factors; *Policy Formation; State Departments of Education; State Surveys; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Supervision; *Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *State Role

ABSTRACT

This report examines recent trends in the establishment of state-level policies for beginning teacher evaluation and supervision. The state role in defining the experiences and clinical preparation of beginning teachers increased substantially during the 1980s; there are, however, important differences in how states approach this responsibility. Summaries of state requirements are reported in the chart entitled "State-Level Policies for Beginning Teacher Performance Evaluation." The chart, which makes up the greater part of the document, was compiled from a literature review conducted in January 1990 and updated with feedback from state departments of education in 46 states and the District of Columbia during the summer of 1991. Due to the nonresponse of Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, and Utah, information for those states was based solely on a literature review. Following an introduction, the publication is organized into six sections: (1) The Extent of State Involvement; (2) The Nature of State Requirements; (3) Assistance or Assessment; (4) The Evolution of Professional Approaches to Beginning Teacher Evaluation: Early Efforts and New Directions; (5) State-Level Policies for Beginning Teacher Performance Evaluation (Chart); and (6) References. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341689

ERIC

BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: AN OVERVIEW OF STATE POLICIES

Eileen Sclan and Linda Darling-Hammond
Teachers College, Columbia University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP033 595

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle ♦ Suite 610 ♦ Washington, DC 20036

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TRENDS AND ISSUES PAPER • NO. 7

BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: AN OVERVIEW OF STATE POLICIES

Eileen Sclan and Linda Darling-Hammond
Teachers College, Columbia University

Published by
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHER EDUCATION
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle • Suite 610 • Washington, DC 20036-1186
March 1992

CITE AS:
Sclan, E., & Darling-Hammond, L. (1992). *Beginning teacher performance evaluation: An overview of state policies.* (Trends and Issues Paper No. 7). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

MANUSCRIPTS:
The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education invites individuals to submit proposals for writing Trends and Issues Papers. Proposals should include:

1. A detailed manuscript proposal of not more than five pages.
2. A vita.
3. A writing sample.

PREPAID ORDERS:
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186
(202) 293-2450
$12 (include $2.50 for shipping and handling)

ISBN 0-89333-092-2

Office of Educational Research and Improvement U.S. Department of Education

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number RI 88062015. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or DOE.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
The Extent of State Involvement	2
The Nature of State Requirements	3
Assistance or Assessment	4
The Evolution of Professional Approaches to Beginning Teacher Evaluation	6
Early Efforts	8
New Directions	11
State-Level Policies for Beginning Teacher Performance Evaluation (Chart)	15
References	45

BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: AN OVERVIEW OF STATE POLICIES

Introduction

This paper reports recent trends in the establishment of state-level policies for beginning teacher evaluation and supervision. The state role in defining the experiences and clinical preparation of beginning teachers has increased substantially over the past decade, though there are important differences in how states approach this responsibility. Summaries of state requirements are reported in the chart entitled "State-Level Policies for Beginning Teacher Performance Evaluation."[1] This chart is intended to be useful to legislators, policymakers, researchers, teachers, administrators, and all those concerned with quality evaluation for beginning teachers.

Beginning teacher performance evaluation programs may have long-lasting effects on the teaching profession. First, the type of evaluation beginning teachers receive may directly affect their teaching styles and orientations, since teachers form many of their ideas about teaching in their first few years of practice (Veenman, 1984). Second, the nature of evaluation and supervision may be one important condition in the workplace environment that affects beginning teachers' commitments and decisions about whether to remain in the profession (Rosenholtz, 1989b). Since about 50% of beginning

[1] The chart was originally compiled from a literature review in January 1990 and then updated with feedback from state departments of education from 46 states and the District of Columbia during the summer of 1991. Due to the nonresponse of Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, and Utah, information for those states was based solely on a literature review. References consulted in the compilation of the original chart include: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1988); Beckham (1981); Bowers and Eberhart (1988); Bradley (1989); Bray, Flakus-Mosqueda, Palaich, and Wilkins (1985); Burry, Poggio, and Glasnapp (1989); Darling-Hammond and Berry (1988); Defino and Hoffman (1984); Delaware State Department of Public Instruction (1988); Ellett, Capie, and Johnson (1980); Enz, Lawhead, Weber, Nelson, and Anderson (1988); Flakus-Mosqueda (1986); French, Holdzkom, and Kuligowski (1990); Friske and Comba (1986); Furtwengler, McLarty, and Malo (1985); Goertz (1988); Hawk and Robards (1987); Helmich (1985); Ishler (1988); Logan, Ellett, and Naik (1990); McNergney, Medley, and Caldwell (1988); Mastain (1988); Medley, Rosenblum, and Vance (1989); Slattery and Hall (1988); Stulac, Stone, Woods, and Worthy (1982); Tanner and Ebers (1985); Tyson-Bernstein (1987); Valentine (1990); Wagner (1985).

teachers leave teaching within about 5 years after entering (Schlechty & Vance, 1983), examining the conditions that may affect retention is critical to developing a strong and stable teaching profession.

The Extent of State Involvement

It is only in the past decade that state departments of education have had any noticeable involvement in designing and implementing programs concerning the evaluation of beginning teachers. Increased state activity in the area of teacher evaluation was a direct response to calls for education reform. These calls also stimulated changes in the regulation of teacher education and certification, many of them closely related to new practices in the evaluation and supervision of first-year teachers. Though requirements for some local evaluation of beginning teachers have existed for many years (29 states require some evaluation beyond that received by tenured teachers), new state programs tend to mandate (and occasionally fund) particular kinds of assistance and assessment for beginners.

The pace of change has been rapid. The first of these recent state initiatives for beginning teacher induction was in 1980 (Ishler, 1988). By 1984, 8 states had enacted policies, and by 1988, 12 states required some specified supervision and/or evaluation procedures for beginning teachers (Mastain, 1988). At the beginning of 1990, 18 states were implementing beginning teacher supervision/evaluation programs, while another 30 had proposals on the drawing board or under consideration.

Today, state involvement continues to accelerate. Forty-five states and the District of Columbia have enacted beginning teacher evaluation programs or requirements. Among these, however, are a number that have had to slow down or suspend implementation of recently developed programs due to funding cutbacks: these include Kansas, Nevada, North Dakota, Louisiana, South Dakota, Utah, and Wisconsin. In addition to the 46 implemented programs or requirements, another three states (Massachusetts, Michigan, and

Vermont) are considering beginning teacher evaluation programs. Only two states do not currently have a policy addressing beginning teacher performance evaluation: Nebraska's beginning teacher program and requirements were repealed due to lack of funding, and at this date, Rhode Island has not implemented or considered performance evaluation requirements or programs for beginners.

The Nature of State Requirements

States that have implemented beginning teacher evaluation programs have either set general requirements for the local evaluation of new teachers or created specific formal programs to guide the clinical learning of new teachers. Some states with general requirements expect local districts to create their own evaluation procedures compatible with state guidelines. These include Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Maine, Missouri, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Utah, and Washington. Other states (Alaska, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, New Hampshire, New York, Oregon, South Dakota, and Wisconsin) require that evaluation be conducted, but they allow local districts to develop their own performance evaluation instruments and procedures. Illinois' state rules include requirements such as teacher involvement in the evaluation plan but specific criteria are not included in the administrative codes.

In many cases, states with general guidelines have also begun to consider specific formal programs for beginning teacher induction and/or evaluation. Currently, Colorado, Minnesota, and Wyoming are considering more formal beginning teacher programs tied to specified state standards. Interestingly, among the others, Kansas, Nevada, South Dakota, Utah, and Wisconsin had at one time developed formal programs, but these were not funded or re-funded and are not now in operation.

Other states have specific formal programs such as induction, mentor, and/or internship policies. Twenty-two states have developed performance evaluation

instruments, criteria, or guidelines with varying degrees of prescriptiveness as to their use. For example, Connecticut and Kentucky require the use of a state-developed instrument for evaluating beginning teachers. Districts in Florida may choose whether to use the state's instrument or develop their own; all but one use the Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS). New Mexico districts may choose among four state models or design their own. Oklahoma's state-developed instrument, though required, uses a narrative format less constraining than some other checklist approaches.

Some states—e.g., Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Oklahoma, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas—have developed instruments that prescribe detailed generic teaching behaviors that all teachers must display. In Tennessee, although local districts may choose either a local or state plan, the state department of education verifies local evaluations of teachers' generic skills during the fourth year of teaching. This type of evaluation model is especially prevalent among southern and southwestern states, in part because many have borrowed from other states' program designs; for example, the Florida system was imported by Kentucky (Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1988), and the Georgia system (though it is now no longer required in Georgia) was adapted by Arizona.

Assistance or Assessment

Whether formal or informal, performance evaluation programs aim to assist and/or assess beginning teachers to one degree or another. Assistance, when it is available, usually takes the form of supervision or feedback from expert colleagues, sometimes designated as mentor teachers, about the new teacher's performance. Assessment, the process by which teacher performance is evaluated, may be either formative or summative in nature. Programs that include professional development plans rely on formative assessments to make recommendations for new teachers' improvement. Summative assessment, often used for certification or continued employment decisions,

makes a determination as to whether an individual teacher's performance meets certain criteria or standards. States requiring beginning teacher performance evaluation as a basis for certification include Connecticut, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Mississippi, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and the District of Columbia.

The earliest versions of beginning teacher evaluation programs emphasized assessment, usually for certification, with assistance tied specifically to mastery of the prespecified skills or behaviors included in the evaluation. The structure of most of these programs is similar: assistance and assessment teams of two or three people (usually an administrator, "mentor" teacher, and state department or university education department representative) observe new teachers two or three times during the first year. Observers are usually trained to use state-developed performance observation instruments; frequently, these list criteria deduced from a portion of the teaching effectiveness literature. In some cases, new teachers are given a development plan to follow. In addition to a varying number of formative evaluations, at least one summative evaluation is required during the first year.

If new teachers fail to demonstrate the behaviors designated as indicators for the required list of competencies, then they are to receive assistance from the team or they attend staff development (Goertz, 1988). Those who still fail to master the competencies cannot receive a teaching license. Thus, in these programs, supervision is focused on the specific behaviors required by the form rather than on problems of practice that might arise (Borko, 1986). As Fox and Singletary (1986) pointed out, since assistance was not state-funded in these early programs but assessment was state-mandated, the evaluation goals frequently overwhelmed what turned out to be uneven attempts at providing real supervision. In addition, they found that the programs' reliance on prespecified teaching behaviors limited the focus of evaluation and assistance: "few [programs] focus on the goals of developing a reflective orientation and the skills essential to self-evaluation."

More recently developed programs stress developmental supervision and assistance for beginning teachers. Ohio and Montana offer assistance only, while California, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Maryland, New York, Virginia, and Washington have enacted mentoring programs which are intended to assist novices, while also often requiring assessment. Although other states like Mississippi and New Mexico call for assistance, state funding to pay mentors for new teachers has not been provided. While some kind of assistance is called for in most states, where formal mentoring programs are absent it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which support is actually provided to new teachers.

The frequency and the quality of assistance and assessment vary greatly among those states that require or suggest evaluation for new teachers. Most programs include at least one summative assessment per year. However, in some states new teachers are observed as many as six times a year; in others it may be only once. Several studies have recently found that the supervision called for, but not funded, in many state programs does not always materialize at the local level (Darling-Hammond, 1991). The extent of assistance provided by funded mentor programs varies by both program design and state/local resources.

On the horizon are new approaches featuring much more extensive supervision and more complex criteria for judgments of teacher competence. For example, California has developed varying district support systems for new teachers that usually include mentors at the school site and from an outside university; they offer initial orientation, practical information, and ongoing instructional advice to ensure that new teachers develop the necessary skills and sensitivities to become successful (Garmston & Bartell, 1991). Flexible enough to address the actual problems of practice encountered by beginning teachers, California's pilot mentoring programs provide the kinds of ongoing support and formative assessment that could propel novices toward reflective and active styles of teaching. The assessment component of the California

programs eventually will be tied to certification, using criteria that emphasize the appropriateness of teacher judgment, rather than requiring specified context-free behaviors.

States such as Minnesota and New York are also developing full-fledged internship programs like those used in other professions. They will provide intensive clinical supervision and training to beginning teachers aimed at the translation of a complex knowledge base into judgmentally sound practice.

The Evolution of Professional Approaches to Beginning Teacher Evaluation

The increased role of states in determining teacher evaluation policies is intimately related to recent attempts to improve and professionalize teaching. On the one hand, a recognition that teacher competence is a critical component of educational quality has created a demand for "professionalizing" policies aimed at enhancing teacher knowledge and skill. On the other hand, though, many early efforts to mandate specific supervision and evaluation strategies unintentionally reinforced nonprofessional conceptions of teaching and modes of assessment. This is not to say that the efforts to provide structure for beginning teacher development have not served a valuable purpose. Performance evaluation programs emerged in the early 1980s as a response to a very specific problem faced by beginning teachers. When beginners become anxious about getting by from day to day, any conviction they have that they can make a difference in their students' learning gives way to "custodial" attitudes toward their students (McArthur, 1979). Isolated from each other, new teachers fall back upon "survival" teaching strategies (Griffin & Millies, 1987).

Learning to teach through trial and error alone limits growth because it leads new teachers to resort to teaching techniques remembered from their own student days rather than learning new approaches from their colleagues (Blase & Greenfield, 1982; Zeichner, 1983). Because isolation was producing

a passive teaching style in new teachers (Lortie, 1975; Feiman-Nemser, 1983), intervention in the "sink-or-swim" induction of beginning teachers was clearly necessary. But many of the inital programs of the 1980s were limited to specifications of content- and context-free teaching behaviors, to be used in all circumstances.

Early Efforts

The subset of "effective teaching" research used to support most of these early evaluation strategies has unearthed many of its own limitations—for example, that teaching behaviors found effective in some situations are not effective or even counterproductive when used too much or under the wrong circumstances (Peterson & Kauchak, 1982; Medley, 1977; Soar, 1977). Meanwhile, other research has found that effective teaching behaviors vary depending on student characteristics, subject matter demands, and instructional goals (Brophy & Evertson, 1977; Cronbach & Snow, 1977; Peterson, 1976; Gage, 1978; McDonald & Elias, 1976). Thus, it is impossible to find a set of context- and content-free teaching behaviors which are uniformly effective under all circumstances.

Because important context variables change the relationship between a given behavior and its outcome, effective teachers in fact vary their behaviors across teaching situations (Shavelson & Dempsey, 1976; Stodolsky, 1984). Unfortunately, even where studies have noted contextual nuances and limitations, such findings have often been ignored when the research is translated into supervision and evaluation schemes. Other bodies of research—such as research on cognition, child development, motivation and behavior, subject-specific pedagogy, and effective schooling—are typically not included at all in the evaluation protocols focused on generic teaching behaviors (French et al., 1990; Darling-Hammond, 1986; Darling-Hammond, Wise, & Pease, 1983).

Over the past decade, research on these early evaluation efforts has found that evaluation strategies which require teachers to demonstrate narrowly prescribed behaviors can induce a passive style of teaching that focuses on the implementation of routines rather than on an ongoing quest for effective practices suited to different needs and contexts (Macmillan & Pendlebury, 1985; Hoover & O'Shea, 1987; Peterson & Comeaux, 1989; Gitlin & Smyth, 1990; Floden & Klinzing, 1990; Darling-Hammond with Sclan, in press). While prescriptive programs simplify the task of evaluation, they create problems of their own. By specifying beforehand what teachers can and cannot do, highly prescriptive standards may put obstacles in the way of individual growth and motivation, causing teachers to focus more on compliance than on their own effectiveness.

Evaluation that views teachers more as technicians who can follow relatively simple, unchanging rules than as professionals who must rely on a complex knowledge base as they make decisions about diverse students in different contexts (McNeil, 1986), may limit teachers' professional growth. If new teachers do not deviate from the prescribed behaviors, they are likely to be ineffective with some students while developing a passive style of teaching which minimizes opportunities for psychic rewards and collaboration with colleagues. They experience a "dual accountability dilemma" in which adherence to specified procedures reduces their capacity to be responsive to the students they serve (Darling-Hammond, 1986). These outcomes are likely, in turn, to reduce their commitment and willingness to remain in teaching, creating a self-perpetuating negative cycle.

When teacher judgment becomes superfluous to performance evaluation, new teachers have fewer motivations to look critically at their own practice; this reduces their chances for success (Ryan, 1979; Tisher, Fyfield, & Taylor, 1979; McDonald, 1980; Rosenholtz, 1989b). The assumption that context is unimportant means that attention to the unique needs of individual children is not legitimated in the evaluation process. The consequent lack of opportunity

to engage in constructive problem solving about specific classroom problems prevents new teachers from developing confidence in their everyday practice (Veenman, 1984). Uncertainty about practice and about how to use knowledge to solve particular problems reduces commitment among teachers (Rosenholtz, 1989a).

Taking into account the feedback about their limitations, some states have modified or eliminated the beginning teacher performance evaluation programs they launched nearly a decade ago. As of 1990, Georgia's Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument is no longer used for certification decisions. Louisiana suspended its performance evaluation program for 1991-92 when teachers overwhelmingly reported problems (Pitsch, 1991). The state's two major teachers' unions claimed that "a flawed instrument and procedures" required "teachers to address 91 items in as little as 30 minutes" (Modest changes, March 20, 1991). In 1991 Virginia replaced its highly prescriptive Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP) with a less prescriptive mentor teacher pilot project.

In Florida, the use of the Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS) was discontinued as a basis for making merit pay awards due to a raft of problems (Hazi, 1989; Darling-Hammond & Berry, 1988), including the fact that Florida's 1986 Teacher of the Year awardee did not pass. Among other things, his evaluators had to mark him down for answering a question with a question, a practice forbidden by the FPMS, though popular with Socrates and other effective teachers. In South Carolina, where a prescriptive evaluation instrument was adopted as part of an education reform package, a majority of teachers reported that morale worsened as a result of the state's reforms (Ginsberg & Berry, 1990). In both Florida and South Carolina, new proposals to initiate professional development school models to support beginning teacher mentoring are now being considered.

New Directions

More recent approaches to beginning teacher performance evaluation—such as the internship programs under development in California, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, and Vermont—recognize the importance of relying on a broader base of knowledge to provide a foundation for teachers' judgments and reflections on their teaching. They envision a full internship year of heavily supervised practice and graduated responsibility as an extension of teacher preparation before teachers are ready to be licensed. They aim to develop teachers who

> possess broad and deep understandings of children, the subjects they teach, the nature of learning and schooling, and the world around them . . . [and who] exemplify the critical thinking they strive to develop in students. (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 28)

These programs acknowledge the complex and unpredictable nature of teaching and understand that the teacher's forethought and reflectiveness are necessary parts of that work. Teacher judgment is seen as essential to the intelligent use of a changing knowledge base for teaching and for responding to the diverse needs of students. The new programs also recognize that evaluation is more successful when teachers and evaluators collaborate in determining goals, processes, and outcomes, and when the process allows for context-specific assistance (Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, & Bernstein, 1985).

As one example of this second generation of performance evaluation, the California New Teacher Project (CNTP) was established to develop new ways of supporting and assessing beginning teachers. In 1988-89, 37 pilot mentoring programs were launched with state funds supplementing districts' in-kind contributions. In lieu of generic teaching behaviors, according to Peterson and Comeaux, the CNTP evaluation approach emphasizes "profes-

sional knowledge and judgment about how, when, where, and with whom to use these techniques, as well as how to change and adapt them where appropriate" (Using technology, 1990, p. 7). In this view, the teacher's role is one of decision maker, not technician.

In this kind of professional performance evaluation program, expert colleagues provide support and continual feedback on new teachers' judgment and behavior. Not surprisingly, the number of CNTP-supported new teachers who remained in teaching between 1988-1990 was 7.5% higher than those new teachers not supported by the CNTP (High quality, 1991).

Recently published proposed standards for Minnesota's internship program are also based on a view of teachers as "thoughtful, creative persons who use a set of principles and strategies derived from an informed personal philosophy of education and the multiple demands of learning contexts" (Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board, 1986). The dispositions, skills, and knowledge required for teaching include, among others, dispositions to "reflect on (one's) own teaching and its effects on learners," to "respect and value individual and cultural differences," and to "engage in critical and divergent thinking and problem-solving with students." A knowledge base for such practice includes knowledge of scientific inquiry and epistemology as well as knowledge about behavior and cognition, cultures, human growth and development, social organizations, ethics, communication and language, learning contexts, and subject matter (Minnesota, 1986).

The proposed Minnesota internship experience differs from the beginning teacher programs in most other states in that it is not merely a set of evaluations to which beginners are subject during their first year of employment as a teacher. As in other professions, interns-in-training will teach partial loads under careful supervision while assuming greater responsibility over time. The optimal structure for such programs will likely be professional development schools—schools that are joint ventures between school systems and

teacher education institutions designed to support the clinical preparation of beginning teachers (Darling-Hammond, Gendler, & Wise, 1990).

Like California's program, the proposed standards for internship programs consciously embrace a conception of teaching as complex and context-dependent and a conception of teacher learning as deliberative. They require that interns experience a variety of teaching situations through a combination of study, observation, and direct practice, including variety in student age or grade levels, subject areas, student learning characteristics, students' cultural backgrounds, and types of communities. In this way, interns will learn to examine different needs and contexts, to question their teaching strategies, and to apply wide-ranging sources of knowledge to the complex problems of practice they face. The programs are to be structured so that interns gain experience in applying their knowledge to major tasks of teaching, in analyzing and using research, and in reflecting upon their own and others' teaching experiences.

The assumption underlying the new program approaches is that beginning teachers who are judged by how well they develop the capacity for "reflective action" (Dewey, 1933) are more likely to create a repertoire of appropriate teaching techniques which allow them to be more responsive to their students. When evaluators expect the beginning teacher to exercise both foresight and hindsight, novices realize that the quality of their thinking matters. In this kind of evaluation, a collaborative growth-oriented environment is intended to perpetuate an active style of teaching in which teachers seek to discover and use an ever-expanding set of strategies to meet student needs, rather than relying on a limited set of routines regardless of their effectiveness with particular students.

In order to nurture beginners' thinking skills, knowledge, and sensitivities to students, a variety of professional development schools (Holmes Group, 1986, 1990) are being created across the country. A number of states, includ-

ing California, Florida, South Carolina, Massachusetts, and Virginia, specifically reported that they are considering or implementing professional development schools. Many others are being developed by individual schools and districts. Novices in professional development schools are coached and judged by their colleagues who foster an atmosphere of critical inquiry which respects the complexities of teaching.

As one example, San Diego's state-funded "professional practice school" program, a joint project of the school system and San Diego State University, aims to create a "supportive, collegial, and collaborative environment of inquiry, research, and experimentation" for new teacher learning (Spotlight, 1991). South Carolina's professional development school approach features a similar emphasis:

> University of South Carolina-Columbia Professional Development Schools are defined as places where collaborative teams of university and school personnel, students, and parents create a climate that supports continuing learning, inquiry, and change. Accepted norms in such schools support questioning, exploring, reconceptualizing, and restructuring the nature of schools and the nature of teacher preparation within real world environments. USC/PDSs are exemplary schools committed to the creation of a new integrated vision that unites schooling, the preparation and development of teachers, and educational research. (A. Todd, personal communication, June 18, 1991)

This vision for the preparation and evaluation of beginning teachers suggests the kind of professional development which can support the development of a profession—one in which beginning teachers learn to make responsible and responsive decisions on behalf of diverse student needs, while assuming a professional's responsibility for perpetual learning, collegial inquiry, and continuing growth.

State-Level Policies for Beginning Teacher Performance Evaluation (Chart)

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATES	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Alabama	The Alabama Professional Personnel Evaluation program was mandated through a resolution adopted by the State Board of Education. The required evaluation criteria were developed for all education positions by a task force of Alabama educators.	School systems can use the state program or they can develop a local evaluation program for teachers but either option requires the use of all state evaluation criteria. Data collection instruments and procedures are being developed. Annual full evaluation is required for all beginning nontenured teachers/specialty teachers.
Alaska	Formal written evaluation required at least once per year, without regard to tenured or nontenured status.	Responsibility for performance evaluation rests with the individual school district. Prior to final adoption, the local procedures must be submitted to the state department for review.
Arizona	State statute requires all teachers in the first 3 consecutive years of teaching to be evaluated twice but evaluation is not tied to certification. The state-funded Arizona Teacher Residency Program includes mentors who assist and assess "residents" who are lst- and 2nd-year teachers; it is a voluntary program and not tied to certification.	Principal or assistant principal evaluates the teacher two times per year in first 3 years using a district instrument. State guidelines require districts to have criteria but state does not specify these criteria. The "mentor" and "resident" are trained to use a state instrument (The Arizona Teacher Residency Assessment Instrument, adapted from Georgia's Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument) to assess 35 generic teaching competencies for formative evaluations during the 1st and 2nd year of teaching; two summative evaluations per year conducted by principal with a district instrument.
Arkansas	Certified Personnel Evaluation Program: State standards require evaluation of all teachers. Evaluators must be certified by attending a workshop given by the Arkansas Department of Education.	Probationary teachers (less than 3 years experience) are observed usually by the principal or assistant principal at least three times per year using state criteria (generic skills) and a district instrument. All teachers have a Professional Growth Plan; those with deficiencies develop an Individual Improvement Plan with the evaluator. Assistance is provided to remove the deficiencies. Summative evaluation reports are required for all teachers.

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATE	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
California	The California New Teacher Project (CNTP) is an induction program that provides assistance and assessment of new teachers in 37 pilot projects.	Begun in 1988-89, state funds supplement in-kind contributions for new teacher support and assessment activities in the CNTP. A wide variety of support and assessment for beginning teachers exists among the 37 alternative models. All the models contain elements which foster communication, reflection, collegiality, and self-evaluation. Necessary support and resources are provided so that new teachers can actively interpret research and make intelligent decisions in the best interests of the children. University faculty work with school district mentor teams in many pilots. In the CNTP innovative forms of teacher assessment are being tried so that the most appropriate measures will be used in a future model of teacher certification by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the California Department of Education (CDE). The CTC and CDE also sponsor additional innovative pilot programs for new teachers: professional practice schools. Local districts are responsible for evaluation procedures and instruments.
Colorado	Certified Personnel Performance Evaluation System (1984, 1990 legislation): establishment of induction standards by 1997 with program implementation in districts by 1999.	Districts required to develop their own evaluation system using state guidelines. System must include locally adopted performance standards.
Connecticut	Statewide Beginning Education Support Training" (BEST) program evaluates beginning teachers for provisional certification and continued employment and provides mentoring support.	State-defined competencies are evaluated in six assessments by six team members (two teachers, two administrators, and two state assessors) using the Connecticut Competency Instrument. Mentor support is for competency mastery.

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATE	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Delaware	Nontenured teachers receive formative and summative evaluation during the first 3 years in the state. State is piloting Skill Assessment Instrument for Beginning Teachers (ETS collaboration).	Nontenured teachers receive three formative reports (observations and conferences), using Lesson Analysis Instrument and one summative report based on the Delaware Performance Appraisal System. The supervisor (usually principal or assistant principal) conducts the evaluation.
District of Columbia	The D.C. Intern Program evaluates beginning teachers for certification and offers assistance from the principal and a teacher.	Predetermined competencies are evaluated by an evaluation team (D.C. Department of Education member, principal, mentor teacher, and site department chair) using a District of Columbia-developed instrument.
Florida	The Professional Orientation Program (POP), formerly the Florida Beginning Teacher Program, provides assistance to beginning teachers and, for certification purposes, assures that all required competencies are demonstrated. All districts are required annually to submit their POP plans to the Florida Department of Education for approval.	The Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS) is used to assist and to evaluate beginning teachers in almost all districts. Each beginner's support team consists of the building administrator, a peer teacher, and one other educator. (The third educator may be a district administrator or college professor but varies according to need and availability.) The beginning teacher is initially screened with the FPMS summative instrument and is evaluated at least three times with appropriate formative instruments before a final summative evaluation by the building administrator. The FPMS does not evaluate all state-required competencies; some are documented in a portfolio or demonstrated in the classroom. The University of South Florida is creating a network of professional development schools for 1991 and 1992; the University of Central Florida and the Orange County Public Schools have established the Institute for Professional Development; the University of North Florida with Clay and Duval Schools are working to assist beginning teachers.

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR
BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATE	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Georgia	As of June 1990, the performance-based certification assessment utilizing the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument was discontinued. Now in use, the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (GTEP) is not tied to certification but provides annual evaluation of all teachers who are required to have a certificate. Satisfactory performance determines eligibility for a step increase on the state salary schedule. The purposes of GTEP are (a) to identify and reinforce effective teaching practices, (b) to identify areas to improve, and (c) to identify teachers who do not meet the minimum standards.	State-defined teaching tasks and dimensions are evaluated by the local school system administrator during three 20-minute unannounced classroom observations. Teachers with deficiencies must develop professional development plans.
Hawaii	Supervision/evaluation of beginning teachers is a part of the statewide program for Assessing Teaching in Hawaii.	At least one summative evaluation required per year. Pilot projects in mentoring and peer coaching are operating for beginning teachers.
Idaho	Idaho Mentor Program for all 1st-year certificated personnel. Now in its 3rd year of state funding, the program guarantees that every new teacher will be paired with a mentor during the first year.	The mentor is usually an expert teacher in the same building as the new teacher. Individual districts develop their own form of support and orientation for new teachers with the state funds. All 1st-, 2nd-, and 3rd-year nonrenewable contract personnel shall be evaluated once prior to the beginning of second semester.
Illinois	State-funded pilot projects for mentor teachers assisting beginning teachers are operating. Supervision/evaluation of beginning teachers is determined by local districts except that legislation requires that teachers not in contractual continued service be evaluated at least once each year.	At least one summative evaluation required per year.

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR
BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATE	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Indiana	The mandated Beginning Teacher Internship Program offers new teachers support and requires evaluation for employment.	The beginning teacher serves an internship with full-day teaching assignment and regular pay. An experienced teacher (who also carries a full-time teaching assignment) serves as mentor to observe, conference, guide, and support regularly. The principal evaluates the beginner on the Beginning Teacher Assessment Inventory. The beginning teacher may elect a university advisor.
Iowa	The new licensure system provides for the completion of a local evaluation process to move to the next licensure level.	There is no state-level system but the state mandates local districts to evaluate beginning teachers.
Kansas	The Kansas Internship Plan was not funded by the legislature.	General guidelines provided by state but all districts must develop a teacher evaluation instrument. Every employee in the first 2 years must be evaluated at least two times per year.
Kentucky	A statewide induction program provides support and evaluation for beginning teachers and out-of-state teachers with less than 2 years experience by a three-member team during the 1st year for certification and employment.	The team consists of the site principal, a trained resource teacher, and a teacher educator or a representative. State-defined generic skills are evaluated by each committee member who observes at least three times during the year. The Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS) was used before a state instrument was developed; at least one summative evaluation report required.

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR
BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATE	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Louisiana	The Louisiana Teaching Internship Program (LTIP) was implemented during the 1990-91 school year. The Louisiana legislature suspended the program for the 1991-92 school year in order to review and revise the program. The revised program will be piloted in the spring of 1992 and implemented during the 1992-93 school year.	LTIP assesses on-the-job teaching performance of interns and provides professional support during the initial years(s) of teaching. Teaching interns are assessed by a team of three evaluators--the intern's principal, a master teacher, and a college faculty member (or other qualified educator)--who observed the intern a total of six times using the state standard assessment instrument, the System for Teaching and Learning Assessment and Review (STAR). This assessment instrument assesses teaching and learning in the intern's classroom and the intern's ability to plan effective lessons. After successfully completing LTIP, intern teachers were to be evaluated under the Louisiana Teacher Evaluation Program (LaTEP). Local school districts are required by law to evaluate all probationary personnel once a year under the local personnel evaluation program. These evaluations are separate from LTIP. The evaluation procedures and criteria vary from district to district and are based on state guidelines.
Maine	A statewide beginning teacher induction program offers support and evaluation for the first 2 years for professional certification.	Local districts implement the state guidelines. A support team of experienced teachers guides the new teacher with the Teacher Action Plan and professional development and assesses the teacher at the end of the provisional period.
Maryland	Exemplary Programs Project: state-funded induction pilot programs (in 1987-88) in five local school systems. The state continues partial funding of the five projects and offers technical assistance to other local districts that begin induction programs.	
Massachusetts	A proposal by the Joint Task Force on Teacher Preparation, to be implemented October 1994, recommends a clinical master's degree for beginning teachers' induction experience. Master's degree candidates will complete a clinical experience.	The candidate would be closely supervised and evaluated during the clinical experience by representatives of the college/university and/or by representatives of the school system.

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATE	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Michigan	The Michigan Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is exploring options for an induction program. Currently, the Michigan Department of Education does not mandate performance evaluation for beginning teachers.	
Minnesota	The Minnesota Board of Teaching (MBOT) is creating a newly proposed structure for teacher education and licensure which includes a supervised internship as a prerequisite to sitting for board examinations and licensure examinations. Abilities to apply knowledge in complex teaching situations will be assessed in the performance-based evaluations.	Schools are required to have a peer review committee to evaluate probationary teachers at least three times each year for 3 years. The school site management team adopts a procedure for written evaluations. Necessary assistance is provided for areas needing improvement.
Mississippi	A legislative mandate requires that all beginning teachers receive support and evaluation from local districts for certification.	A three-member team evaluates the new teacher on 14 state-defined generic competencies with a state developed instrument. Remediation offered for deficiencies. Building principal is one of evaluators and is responsible for staff development.
Missouri	All beginning teachers follow a professional development plan for their first 2 years. Support and evaluation provided by the local districts and assistance from the school that graduated the new teacher.	The State Department of Education prepared voluntary guidelines for the beginning teacher program; a state evaluation instrument is used. At least one summative evaluation report is required per year for probationary teachers.
Montana	The Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council presented to the Board of Education a proposal, which received funding, for a pilot beginning teacher mentorship program to be in place for 1992-93. No component for beginning teacher assessment.	

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATE	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Nebraska	The State Department of Education developed a 3-year apprentice/provisional certificate for all new teachers but it was repealed due to lack of funding.	Legislation required evaluation every semester for the first 3 years but it was repealed due to lack of funding.
Nevada	A statewide beginning teacher internship program was introduced in the 1986 legislature but no funds were allocated.	Four summative evaluations per year required for probationary teachers. LEA places all new teachers on minimum of 1-year probation.
New Hampshire	Four pilot sites for teacher induction were established during 1990-91. Evaluative criteria were developed independently by each site.	Criteria developed locally.
New Jersey	In September 1992, all beginning teachers will be required to serve the 1st year of teaching under provisional certification. Professional Development Schools are being considered for some urban districts.	First-year teacher (alternate and traditional) will be evaluated for certification purposes on three occasions by the principal. After the 10th and 20th weeks of full-time teaching, formative evaluations are conducted. At the end of 30 weeks, a final and summative evaluation is provided upon which the principal judges the eligibility of the provisional teacher to receive standard certification.
New Mexico	New Educator Support Program: new teachers must receive support for 1 to 3 years until they meet minimum competencies required by the state. All licensed staff must be placed on a Professional Development Plan (PDP) which is designed to assist teachers to meet competencies.	The State Board of Education adopted four induction models but local districts may design their own. Evaluation and support based upon generic competencies.
New York	The legislature funded 77 individual mentor teacher programs for support and supervision of beginning teachers. Regulations under consideration for uniform statewide internship program for 1993.	The evaluation process is a local district responsibility.

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATE	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
North Carolina	Teachers who are issued an Initial Certificate are assigned a mentor and/or support team.	A mentor or support team assists the teacher in development of generic teaching skills measured by the North Carolina Performance Appraisal Instrument. Three formal observations are required (but local plans may require more) over a 2-year period. At the end of 2 years continuing professional certification is granted or withheld. Simultaneously, the principal uses the North Carolina Teacher Performance Appraisal Instrument which includes instructional and noninstructional behaviors. The principal may conduct observations or provide assistance to teachers which are not related to the support team's function (to certify). The principal makes employment decisions based on evaluation outcomes.
North Dakota	The Teachers Professional Practices Commission adopted a statewide professional development model for teachers but it is not funded yet. A 1st-year mentor model is being developed for rural areas.	Legislation requires teacher evaluations twice a year for the first 3 years in the district.
Ohio	A total of $2.5 million was initially appropriated to support Entry Year Programs in 1990-91. Competitive applications for funds were submitted for Entry Year Programs to provide professional support to meet the needs of individuals in the 1st year of employment under a classroom teaching certificate.	Ohio's Entry Year Program provides support to 1st-year teachers. Its focus is on professional development, engaging in a wide variety of opportunities for growth in the knowledge and skills of teaching. State minimum standards require that certificated staff be supervised and evaluated according to a planned sequence of observations and evaluation conferences.
Oklahoma	The legislated Entry-Year Assistance Program evaluates and assists beginning teachers during licensure and provides recommendation for standard certification or a 2nd year of licensure.	A three-member team (building administrator, experienced teacher as consultant, and one higher education representative) observes the new teacher at least three times prior to recommendation for certification. A state-developed narrative observation instrument is used for the evaluation of Entry-Year teachers. As a condition for re-employment, probationary teachers are evaluated twice yearly during the first 3 years of employment in a district. A district checklist evaluation based upon Oklahoma Minimum Criteria for Effective Teaching (which focus on generic skills) is used.

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATE	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Oregon	State Department of Education Beginning Teacher Support Program with focus on support, service, and assistance began in 1987-88. Currently, it funds an average of 700 beginning teachers yearly. Participation is voluntary by district.	Teachers in their first 3 years must be evaluated annually. Formal observations occur a minimum of twice per year. At least one summative evaluation report per year is required for probationary/temporary teachers.
Pennsylvania	A state induction program offers support and evaluation for new teachers (with district funds). Continued employment is not contingent upon the induction program. Instructional II certification is required before end of 6 years to continue teaching. (A separate alternative route program is offered in 21 colleges and universities.)	New teachers are evaluated by principals according to state guidelines but details of support and evaluation are left to local districts; at least two scheduled classroom observations per year by supervisor and two summative evaluation reports are required per year.
Rhode Island	No beginning teacher evaluation policy.	

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATE	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
South Carolina	Required by law, all 1st-year teachers must be evaluated with the state-developed Assessment of Performance in Teaching (APT) instrument; teachers who successfully pass the instrument are eligible for annual contracts; teachers who do not pass are eligible for a second provisional contract and subject to re-evaluation by the APT; teachers who are unsuccessful on the instrument during their 2nd year are not employable in South Carolina schools for 2 years during which they must earn six credit units in the area of deficiency and six credit units for certificate renewal. These teachers re-enter at the contract level attained before dismissal (provisional). The opportunity for re-entry into the profession shall be available only once. The State Department of Education is investigating longer and more structured internships using the Professional Development School model, building on the University of South Carolina's liaisons in 10 Professional Development Schools.	New teachers are observed three times during the fall for the 1st year with the state-developed APT instrument. If the composite evaluation is not satisfactory, teachers may be re-evaluated (including three additional observations) in the spring. Once teachers have successfully completed the APT and have been granted annual contract status, local districts evaluate them annually using their choice of instruments which must meet Procedural and Content Criteria established by the State Board of Education. Teachers may remain on annual contracts for a maximum of 2 years. After successfully completing the annual contract year(s), teachers are granted continuing contracts and are evaluated by local district instruments a minimum of once every 3 years.
South Dakota	A statewide induction program for all teachers with 1st-year certificates that provided support and evaluation for certification was repealed.	All teachers are required to be evaluated annually and all districts are required to develop an evaluation policy.

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATE	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Tennessee	As part of the legislated Career Ladder Program, mentor teachers assist and evaluate beginning teachers during the 1st (probationary) and 2nd through 4th (apprentice) years; but not tied to licensure. A Beginning Teacher Program (BTP) is under development to provide support for 1st-year teachers using collaborative efforts of mentor teaching principals and higher education.	Teachers holding probationary and apprentice certificates must be evaluated each year by the local school districts using either a locally developed evaluation model approved by the State Board of Education or a state-developed local evaluation plan. In the 4th year, the State Department of Education conducts verification evaluations of teachers' local evaluation results with a generic skills focus. If the state verification is positive, the teacher receives a Professional License and the optional Career Level I Certificate; if verification is negative the teacher may request another apprentice license. At least one summative evaluation report is required for probationary and apprentice teachers per year through 4th year; implemented by local school system. The BTP will provide support and coaching from mentor teachers, observations of experienced teachers, and frequent in-service sessions. The beginning teacher will receive continuous formative evaluations from the mentor teacher and the principal.
Texas	State law requires the Texas Education Agency, the Higher Education Coordinating Board, and the public university to develop a comprehensive teacher induction program. The program was piloted during 1988-90 for full implementation in 1991.	New teachers are assigned a mentor for support and assistance. The principal provides evaluative supervision. The Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS) requires that every teacher be observed 45 minutes four times a year for re-employment. The principal conducts two evaluations and a trained second evaluator conducts two evaluations. The TTAS focuses on generic teaching behaviors for placement on the career ladder.
Utah	The state induction plan provides a 2-year beginning teacher assessment period and support (on hold pending funds). Presently, 2 years of successful teaching required for certification.	During the first 2 years, local districts evaluate new teachers along state guidelines (based on criteria for effective performance). Schools of education will offer field support to their graduates and remediation for deficiencies; nontenured teachers must have six scheduled classroom observations per year by supervisor.

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATE	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
Vermont	Vermont currently has no comprehensive beginning teacher program. In order to move from a Beginning Educator's License (Level I) to a Professional Educator's License (Level II), a teacher must successfully complete 2 years of teaching. The Standards Board for Professional Educators is considering a new teacher support and assessment program.	
Virginia	The Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP) which assessed generic competencies was rescinded by the 1991 session of the Virginia General Assembly. The State Department of Education is piloting a mentor teacher program during 1991-92 in about 30 school divisions, selected through a Request for Proposal plan. The department will use the pilot results to develop a statewide program for 1992-93. George Mason University has begun placing education graduate students in Professional Development Schools where educators and researchers work collaboratively.	Legislation and State Department of Education policy require teacher evaluation; a least one summative evaluation report required every 2 years.
Washington	A Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (pilot) provides mentor teachers for new teachers. Each local school district is required to establish and implement an evaluation program consisting of minimum evaluation criteria as set forth by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.	All teachers are to be observed by principals or their designees for evaluation at least twice with the total observation time not less than 60 minutes. New teachers are required to be observed at least once for a total observation time of 30 minutes during the first 90 calendar days of their employment.

STATE-LEVEL POLICIES FOR BEGINNING TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

STATE	PROGRAM TITLE AND/OR DESCRIPTION	NATURE OF EVALUATION PROCESS
West Virginia	County organizations must provide orientation for new teachers. Legislated beginning teacher program provides assistance and assessment; re-employment contingent upon evaluation.	Principals or supervisors evaluate beginning teachers two times per year with at least four observations. The observations and evaluations are based upon teachers' responsibilities and performance criteria.
Wisconsin	The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction has developed guidelines for a beginning teacher assistance program from their experience with pilot programs 1985-88. (This program would not be tied to certification or a performance assessment instrument.) Due to lack of state funding, districts may adopt this program on a voluntary basis.	A performance assessment instrument for beginning teachers was developed during the pilot projects (1985-88) and may be used by districts but on a voluntary basis due to lack of state funding. Legislation requires that all teachers be evaluated every 3 years but does not specify a performance evaluation instrument.
Wyoming	The Professional Standards Board and two other groups are working on induction programs.	Legislation requires teacher evaluation.

References

References identified with an EJ or ED number have been abstracted and are in the ERIC database. Journal articles (EJ) should be available at most research libraries; documents (ED) are available in ERIC microfiche collections at more than 700 locations. Documents can also be ordered through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service: (800) 433-ERIC. For more information contact the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-1186; (202) 293-2450.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1988). *Teacher education policy in the states. A 50-state survey of legislative and administrative actions.* Washington, DC: Author. ED 296 997

Beckham, J. C. (1981). *Legal aspects of teacher evaluation.* Topeka, KS: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education. ED 207 126 (not available from EDRS)

Blase, J. J., & Greenfield, W. (1982, May). On the meaning of being a high school teacher: The beginning years. *The High School Journal, 65*(8), 263-271. EJ 266 114

Borko, H. (1986). Clinical teacher education: The induction years. In J. V. Hoffman & J. Edwards (Eds.), *Reality and reform in teacher education.* New York: Random House.

Bowers, G. R., & Eberhart, N. A. (1988, Summer). Mentors and the entry year program. *Theory into Practice, 27*(3), 226-230. EJ 383 214

Bradley, A. (1989, September 13). In Connecticut, moving past pencil and paper. *Education Week,* pp. 1, 22.

Bray, J. L., Flakus-Mosqueda, P., Palaich, R. M., & Wilkins, J. S. (1985). *New directions for state teacher policies.* (No. TR-85-1). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. ED 306 202

Brophy, J. E., & Evertson, C. M. (1977). Teacher behavior and student learning in second and third grades. In G. D. Borich (Ed.), *The appraisal of teaching: Concepts and process.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Burry, J. A., Poggio, J. P., & Glasnapp, D. R. (1989). *The Kansas internship program assistance/assessment model; A product of the interdependence of research and practice.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. ED 308 222

Cronbach, L. J., & Snow, R. E. (1977). *Aptitudes and instructional methods: A handbook for research on interactions.* New York: Irvington.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1986, March). A proposal for evaluation in the teaching profession. *Elementary School Journal, 86*(4), 531-551. EJ 337 997

Darling-Hammond, L. (1991). *Teaching and knowledge: Policy issues posed by alternate certification for teachers.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (1988). *The evolution of teacher policy.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. ED 298 599 (not available from EDRS)

Darling-Hammond, L., Gendler, T., & Wise, A. E. (1990). *The teaching internship: Practical preparation for a licensed profession.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. ED 326 512 (not available from EDRS)

Darling-Hammond, L., with Sclan, E. (in press). Policy and supervision. In C. Glickman (Ed.), *Supervision in transition.* Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A. E., & Pease, S. (1983, Fall). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 53*(3), 285-328. EJ 290 819

Defino, M. E., & Hoffman, J. V. (1984). *A status report and content analysis of state mandated teacher induction programs.* (Report No. 9057). Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. ED 251 438

Delaware State Department of Public Instruction. (1988). *Delaware performance appraisal system: Teacher appraisal process.* Dover, DE: Author. ED 304 404

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think.* New York: D.C. Heath.

Ellett, C. D., Capie, W., & Johnson, C. E. (1980, December). Assessing teacher performance. *Educational Leadership, 38*(3), 219-220. EJ 238 601

Enz, B., Lawhead, D., Weber, B., Nelson, C., & Anderson, G. (1988, June). *Arizona teacher residency project.* Paper presented at the Association of Teacher Educators Leadership Academy on Planning and Implementing Induction and Beginning Teacher Support Programs, Providence, RI. ED 298 105

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. S. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook on teaching and policy* (pp. 150-170). New York: Longman. See ED 234 043

Flakus-Mosqueda, P. (1986, Summer). Teacher testing and performance standards: A survey of selected state policies. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 13*(3), 8-27.

Floden, R. E., & Klinzing, H. G. (1990, June-July). What can research on teacher thinking contribute to teacher preparation? A second opinion. *Educational Researcher, 19*(5), 15-20. EJ 414 359

Fox, S. M., & Singletary, T. J. (1986, January-February). Deductions about supportive induction. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(1), 12-15. EJ 333 693

French, R. L., Holdzkom, D., & Kuligowski, B. (1990, April). *Teacher evaluation in SREB states. Stage I: Analysis and comparison of evaluation systems.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Friske, J. S., & Comba, M. (1986, Summer). Teacher induction programs: An Oklahoma perspective. *Action in Teacher Education, 8*(2), 67-74. EJ 339 555

Furtwengler, C., McLarty J., & Malo, G. (1985, April). *The career ladder program in Tennessee.* Paper presented to the National Council on Measurement in Education, Chicago, IL. ED 268 073

Gage, N. L. (1978). *The scientific basis of the art of teaching.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Garmston, S., & Bartell, C. (Eds.). (1991). *New teacher success: You can make a difference.* Riverside, CA: County Office of Education, California Department of Education and Commission on Teacher Credentialing with the California New Teacher Project.

Ginsburg, R., & Berry, B. (1990, March). Experiencing school reform: The view from South Carolina. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*(7), 549-552. EJ 403 812

Gitlin, A., & Smyth, J. (1990, Winter). Toward educative forms of teacher evaluation. *Educational Theory, 40*(1), 83-94. EJ 406 300

Goertz, M. E. (1988). *State educational standards in the 50 states: An update.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. See ED 275 726

Griffin, G. A., & Millies, S. (Eds.). (1987). *The first years of teaching: Background papers and a proposal.* Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education. ED 285 833

Hawk, P. P., & Robards, S. (1987). Statewide teacher induction programs. In D. M. Brooks (Ed.), *Teacher induction: A new beginning* (pp. 33-43). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators. See ED 279 624

Hazi, H. M. (1989, Spring). Measurement versus supervisory judgment: The case of *Sweeney v. Turlington. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 4*(3), 211-229. EJ 387 068

Helmich, E. (1985). *An overview of fifth-year teacher education programs.* Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Planning, Research, and Evaluation. ED 267 054

High quality new teacher support need not be costly. (1991, May). *New Teacher News. Newsletter of the California New Teacher Project,* pp. 1-2.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, MI: Author. ED 270 454

Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools.* East Lansing, MI: Author. ED 328 533

Hoover, N. L., & O'Shea, L. J. (1987). *The influence of a criterion checklist on supervisors' and interns' conceptions of teaching.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.

Ishler, P. (1988, October). *A report on successful teacher induction programs: The whys, whats, and wherefores for Texas.* Paper presented at the Annual Texas Conference on Teacher Education, Dallas, TX. ED 301 562

Logan, C. S., Ellett, C. D., & Naik, N. S. (1990, April). *Teaching and learning components for induction and renewable teacher certification: A statewide verification study.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher. A sociological study.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McArthur, J. (1979). Teacher socialization: The first five years. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 25,* 264-274.

McDonald, F. J. (1980). *Study of induction programs for beginning teachers. The problems of beginning teachers: A crisis in teaching.* (Vol. 1). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. ED 257 778

McDonald, F. J., & Elias, P. (1976). *Beginning teacher evaluation study, Phase II 1973-74. Executive summary report.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. ED 142 592

Macmillan, C. J. B., & Pendlebury, S. (1985, Fall). The Florida performance measurement system: A consideration. *Teachers College Record, 87*(1), 67-78. EJ 324 596

McNeil, L. M. (1986). *Contradictions of control. School structure and school knowledge.* New York: Routledge.

McNergney, R. F., Medley, D. M., & Caldwell, M. S. (1988, May-June). Making and implementing policy on teacher licensure. *Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(3), 28-44. EJ 384 742

Mastain, R. K. (Ed.). (1988, update). *NASDTEC manual. Support systems for beginning teachers.* Sacramento, CA: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.

Medley, D. M. (1977). *Teacher competence and teacher effectiveness: A review of process-product research.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. ED 143 629

Medley, D. M., Rosenblum, E. P., & Vance, N. C. (1989, March). Assessing the functional knowledge of participants in the Virginia beginning teacher assistance program. *Elementary School Journal, 89*(4), 495-510. EJ 387 708

Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board. (1986). *Minnesota's vision for teacher education: Stronger standards, new partnerships. Report of the task force on teacher education for Minnesota's future.* St. Paul, MN: Author. ED 274 662

Modest changes in La. teacher evaluation proposed. (1991, March 29). *Education Week,* pp. 20.

Peterson, K., & Kauchak, D. (1982). *Teacher evaluation: Perspectives, practices and promises.* Salt Lake City, UT: Center for Educational Practice, University of Utah. ED 233 996

Peterson, P. L. (1976). *Interactive effects of student anxiety, achievement orientation, and teacher behavior on student achievement and attitude.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford. See EJ 184 181

Peterson, P. L., & Comeaux, M. A. (1989, March). *Evaluating the systems: Teachers' perspectives on teacher evaluation.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. See EJ 414 307

Pitsch, M. (1991, May 29). Senate moving to revamp La.'s teacher-evaluation system. *Education Week,* pp. 16.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989a). *Teacher's workplace. The social organization of schools.* New York: Longmann.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989b, March). Workplace conditions that affect teacher quality and commitment: Implications for teacher induction programs. *Elementary School Journal, 89*(4), 421-39. EJ 387 704

Ryan, K. (1979). Toward understanding the problem: At the threshold of the profession. In K. R. Howey & R. H. Bents (Eds.), *Toward meeting the needs of the beginning teacher* (pp. 35-52). Minneapolis: Midwest Teacher Corps Network and University of Minnesota.

Schlechty, P. C., & Vance, V. S. (1983, March). Recruitment, selection, and retention: The shape of the teaching force. *Elementary School Journal, 83*(4), 469-487. EJ 281 544

Shavelson, R., & Dempsey, N. (1976). Generalizability of measures of teacher behavior. *Review of Educational Research, 46*(4), 553-611. EJ 157 785

Slattery, P., & Hall, G. (1988). *Models of teacher evaluation.* (Policy Bulletin No. 2.) Bloomington, IN: Consortium on Educational Policy Studies. ED 297 456

Soar, R. S. (1977). An integration of findings from four studies on teacher effectiveness. In G. D. Borich (Ed.), *The appraisal of teaching: Concepts and process*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Stulac, J. F., II, Stone, J. W., Woods, D. G., & Worthy, D. H. (1982). *Procedure and results of measurement in the South Carolina assessments of performance in teaching*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. ED 221 590

Spotlight: San Diego Unified/San Diego State University. (1991, February). *New Teacher News. Newsletter of the California New Teacher Project*, pp. 4.

Stodolsky, S. S. (1984, November). Teacher evaluation: The limits of looking. *Educational Researcher, 13*(9), 11-18. EJ 309 391

Tanner, C. K., & Ebers, S. M. (1985, May-June). Factors related to the beginning teachers' successful completion of a competency evalution. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(3), 41-44. EJ 320 460

Tisher, K. P., Fyfield, J. A., & Taylor, S. M. (1979). *Beginning to teach: The induction of beginning teachers in Australia* (Vols. 1, 2) (ERDC Reports No. 15, 20). Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service. See ED 162 961

Tyson-Bernstein, H. (1987, Spring). The Texas teacher appraisal system: What does it really appraise? *American Educator, 11*(1), 26-31. EJ 351 825

Using technology for assessment. (1990, November). *New Teacher News. Newsletter of the California New Teacher Project*, pp. 7.

Valentine, J. (1990, April). *A national survey of state teacher evaluation policies.* Unpublished research paper, University of Missouri, Columbia.

Veenman, S. (1984, Summer). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 54*(2), 143-178. EJ 307 800

Wagner, L. A. (1985, November). Ambiguities and possibilities in California's mentor teacher program. *Educational Leadership, 43*(3), 23-29. EJ 329 577

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., & Bernstein, H. T. (1985, September). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. *Elementary School Journal, 86*(1), 61-121. EJ 324 222

Zeichner, K. (1983). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of teaching. In G. A. Griffin & H. Hukill (Eds.), *First years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues? Proceedings from a national working conference* (pp. 1-59). Austin, TX: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. See ED 240 109